

REMARKS

This paper is filed in response to the official action dated October 27, 2009 (hereafter, the “official action”). This paper is timely filed as it is accompanied by a petition for extension of time and authorization to charge our credit card account in the amount of the requisite fee. The Director is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency in the fees filed, asserted to be filed or which should have been filed herewith to our Deposit Account No. 13-2855, under Order No. 29610/CDT414.

Claims 1-38 are pending, but claims 16-25 and 27-38 have been withdrawn. Claims 6, 9-15, and 26 have been objected to, but are allowable in substance.

Claims 1-5, 7, and 8 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as assertedly obvious over Tanamura et al. (JP 10-144469) in view of Thompson et al. (US Patent 6,210,814).

As an initial matter, the applicants acknowledge with appreciation the telephonic interview with Examiner Choi earlier today during which the outstanding art-based rejections were discussed.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. §103(A)

Claims 1-5, 7, and 8 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as assertedly obvious over Tanamura et al. (JP 10-144469) in view of Thompson et al. (US Patent 6,210,814). The applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

Tanamura discloses an organic electroluminescent device comprising a transparent, heat resistant substrate, an anode, an organic luminescent layer, and a cathode. By reacting a polyfunctional acrylate monomer with a polyfunctional mercapto compound, a photo-setting resin is formed which is then used to manufacture the transparent, heat resistant *substrate* of an organic electroluminescent device.

Thompson discloses an emissive layer comprising (1) a host material, (2) an emissive molecule as a first dopant in the host material, and (3) a polarization molecule that affects the wavelength of light emitted by the emissive molecule when the emissive molecule luminesces as a second dopant in the host material.

Substrates and emissive layers are well known to be distinct layers having distinct functions in light emitting devices. Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to modify the substrate of Tanamura to include either the emissive molecule dopant or the polarization molecule dopant disclosed in the emissive layer of Thompson.

Furthermore, neither the monomer containing polyfunctional acrylate nor the polyfunctional mercapto compound disclosed in Tanamura are charge transporting or light emissive, as recited in claims 1-5, 7, and 8. Rather, they are actually transparent and insulative in order to form a heat resistant, transparent substrate as described therein. In any case, there is certainly no disclosure or suggestion in Tanamura of further providing an emissive dopant or a charge transporting dopant in the insulative, transparent substrate disclosed in Tanamura. Further, Thompson fails to provide any motivation to incorporate such a dopant into the substrate disclosed by Tanamura.

Additionally, including a charge transporting dopant or emissive dopant, as claimed, into the substrate disclosed by Tanamura is at odds with the teachings of Tanamura and would likely render the substrate disclosed in Tanamura inoperative for its intended purpose. For example, the substrate of Tanamura would have decreased heat resistance and transparency after incorporating a charge transporting dopant or emissive dopant therein.

Moreover, claims 1-5, 7, and 8, as amended herein, now recite a mixture of at least one monomer with the formula: $A-(X)_n$, and at least one monomer with the formula: $B-(Y)_m$, the mixture further comprising at least one of an emissive dopant and a charge transporting dopant. Accordingly, the examiner's statement that "the composition disclosed by Tanamura et al. is interpreted to comprise an organic luminescent layer and a substrate" is inapplicable as none of the cited art, whether taken individually, or in combination, suggests a mixture as claimed.

Accordingly, the outstanding claim rejections should be withdrawn.

REQUEST TO REJOIN CLAIMS 16, 17, 19-25, 27-29, 32, 33, AND 36-38

Pursuant to MPEP § 821.04(a), a requirement for restriction should be withdrawn when a generic claim, linking claim, or subcombination claim is allowable and any previously withdrawn claim depends from or otherwise requires all the

limitations thereof. Similarly, pursuant to MPEP § 821.04(b), withdrawn process claims which depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of an allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder.

In view of the foregoing, the applicants respectfully request rejoinder of claims 16, 17, 19-25, 27-29, 32, 33, and 36-38, and respectfully submit that the restriction requirement would still apply to original claims 18, 30, 31, 34, and 35.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Should the examiner wish to discuss any matter of form or procedure in an effort to advance this application to allowance, the examiner is respectfully invited to telephone the undersigned attorney at the indicated telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP

April 27, 2010



Andrew M. Lawrence, Reg. No. 46,130
Attorney for Applicants
6300 Willis Tower
233 S. Wacker Drive
Chicago, Illinois 60606-6357
(312) 474-6300